



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

to move along the roads would permit him to subsequently revisit that county at his pleasure, without any risk of being served with legal process while he was within its boundaries." A statute requiring automobile owners who are non-residents to consent to service of process upon the secretary of State, as service upon them personally, was held valid in *Cleary v. Johnston*, 79 N. J. L. 49, 74 Atl. 538, 8 MICH. L. REV. 417.

CORPORATIONS—ISSUE OF STOCK—CORPORATION OF TWO STATES.—Defendant corporation was organized under the laws of Missouri and the laws of Ohio. By the laws of Missouri preferred stock could not be issued without the consent of all the stockholders. By the laws of Ohio consent of a majority only was necessary. A meeting of the stockholders was called in Ohio, and an act of the directors in issuing preferred stock was ratified by a majority of the stockholders. This act was attacked by a stockholder in the New York courts. *Held*, the corporate acts had to conform to all the laws under which the corporation was empowered to act, and, since the laws of Missouri required the consent of all the stockholders, the issue of preferred stock was illegal. *Pollitz v. Wabash R. Co. et al.* (N. Y. 1912) 135 N. Y. Supp. 785.

In a very able and interesting article, in 4 COL. L. REV. 391, on the subject, "Corporations of two States," Professor BEALE states this same principle as a well settled rule of law. To the same effect are the following authorities: 4 COOK, CORP. (Ed. 6), § 910; 4 THOMPSON, CORP. (Ed. 2), § 3558; 2 CLARK & MARSHALL, CORP., § 362 f; *State of Maryland v. Northern Central Ry. Co.*, 18 Md. 193, 213; *Fisk v. Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific R. R. Co.*, 53 Barb. 513. It is doubtless true that the rule would be applied in the State where the limitation on the power of the corporation existed, and might be applied in a State where the company was not incorporated; but it may be doubted whether the rule would be applied in a State where the company was also incorporated and where no such limitation on its powers existed. ELLIOTT, RAILROADS, § 27; *Atwood v. Shenandoah Valley R. Co.*, 85 Va. 966, 9 S. E. 748, 38 Am. & Eng. R. R. Cas. 534; *Muller v. Dows*, 94 U. S. 444.

COURTS—JURISDICTION—DAMAGE TO REAL PROPERTY WITHOUT THE STATE—NEGLIGENCE.—Defendant negligently operated a locomotive, while passing plaintiff's real property in New Jersey, thereby setting fire to and damaging the premises, for which injury plaintiff seeks redress in the New York courts. *Held*, (by a divided court) that an action in trespass on the case sounding in negligence, for injury to real property is a local action and therefore cannot be prosecuted in the New York courts but must be maintained in the jurisdiction where the real property is located. *Brisbane v. Pennsylvania R. Co.* (N. Y. 1912) 98 N. E. 752.

The rule as stated by the majority opinion is in full accord with the weight of authority both in this country and in England: *Livingston v. Jefferson*, 1 Brock. 203, Fed. Cas. No. 8, 411; *DuBreuil v. Pennsylvania Co.*, 130 Ind. 137, 29 N. E. 109; *Bettys v. Milwaukee and St. P. R. Co.*, 37 Wis. 323; *Morris v. Missouri Pac. R. Co.*, 78 Tex. 17; 14 S. W. 228, 9 L. R. A. 349; *Missouri Pac. R. Co. v. Cullers*, 81 Tex. 382, 17 S. W. 19, 13 L. R. A. 542; note to *Smith v. Southern R. R.*, 26 L. R. A. (N. S.) 928; *Doulson v.*